

SECTION F – EVALUATION CRITERIA AND METHOD OF AWARD

F.1 FAR 52.212-2 - EVALUATION—COMMERCIAL ITEMS (JAN 1999)

(a) The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror(s) whose offer(s) conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. Section F.3 Phase I – Evaluation Criteria below identifies the factors to be used to evaluate offers.

(b) *Options*. The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement for the noted CLINs. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(c) A written notice of award or acceptance of an offer mailed or otherwise furnished to the successful Offeror(s) within the time for acceptance specified in the offer, shall result in a binding contract without further action by either party. Before the offer's specified expiration time, the Government may accept an offer (or part of an offer), whether or not there are negotiations after its receipt, unless a written notice of withdrawal is received before award.

F.2 GSAM 552.217-71 NOTICE REGARDING OPTION(S) (NOV 1992)

The General Services Administration (GSA) has included an option to extend the term of this contract in order to demonstrate the value it places on quality performance by providing a mechanism for continuing a contractual relationship with a successful Offeror(s) that perform at a level which meets or exceeds GSA's quality performance expectations as communicated to the Contractor, in writing, by the Contracting Officer or designated representative. When deciding whether to exercise the option, the Contracting Officer will consider the quality of the Contractor's past performance under this contract in accordance with 48 CFR 517.207.

F.3 PHASE I - EVALUATION CRITERIA

This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR). For purposes of this phase of the acquisition, best value will be based on the following factors:

Technical Factors

- Performance Work Statement (PWS)
- Project Management Plan
- Demonstration
- Key Personnel/Resumes

Non-Technical Factors

- Socio-Economic
- Past Performance

Price Factors

- Price

At the conclusion of Phase I evaluations, the Government will invite the most highly rated Offeror(s) to Phase II to undergo IV&V, as an additional factor in making the final award decision(s) which is described in Section F.5, Phase II Evaluation – Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V), below.

F.3.1 Relative Importance of Evaluation Factors for Phase I:

Technical Factors:

- PWS, Project Management Plan, Demonstration and Key Personnel/Resumes are equally important.

Non-Technical Factors:

- Socio-Economic is more important than Past Performance.

Price Factors:

- Price

When combined, Technical factors are more important than Non-Technical factors.

Technical and Non-Technical Factors combined are worth more than Price Factors.

As technical merit becomes more equal, price becomes more important.

F.3.2 Basis of Award for Phase I:

F.3.2.1 Technical Factor One – Performance Work Statement (PWS) – Phase I:

In evaluating the PWS, the Government will look for clear evidence that the Offeror completely understands all of the requirements and objectives. The “Whats” of the PWS should clearly match up to the requirements of the RFP. It should leave the Government with a high-degree of confidence that ETS2 will be delivered timely, will be easy to use, will interface effectively with agency business systems, well managed, and will result in high User-satisfaction.

An acceptable PWS fully maps and matches all mandatory requirements, and leaves the Government confident that the Offeror will be successful in the contract. Performance standards are clear and measurable and will ensure ETS2 requirements are achieved.

An outstanding PWS not only comprehensively identifies and maps all mandatory requirements; it also completely addresses all objectives. It leaves the Government confident that not only will the Offeror perform successfully, but that it will deliver superior service from contract kickoff all the way through contract close-out. The voice of the customer will come through loudly, clearly, and consistently—that is, the PWS is customer centric. The PWS recognizes that there will be unknowns, such as changes in law or regulation or changes in technology or security protocols, and clearly identifies a plan for how to implement future changes in an outstanding manner. Performance standards are clear, measurable and will ensure ETS2 goals, requirements and objectives are achieved and exceeded.

F.3.2.2 Technical Factor Two – Project Management Plan – Phase I:

In evaluating the Project Management Plan, the Government will look for clear evidence that the Offeror completely understands all of its objectives. The “Hows” of the Project Management Plan

should clearly match up both to the requirements of the RFP and to the specifics of the proposed PWS. The Project Management Plan should leave the Government with a high-degree of confidence that ETS2 will be delivered timely, will be easy to use, will interface effectively with agency business systems, managed well, and will result in high user-satisfaction.

An acceptable Project Management Plan fully addresses how their ETS2 will facilitate adherence to the FTR and include agency policy filters. It addresses usability requirements including the ease of use and intuitiveness objectives of the RFP. All data and interoperability goals are met with clear service boundaries and interoperability points. The Offeror's organizational structure defines roles and responsibilities, organizational reporting, and appropriate authority levels to accomplish tasks and resolve issues. The Communication Plan ensures Users and GSA are kept informed. There is a clear well-articulated focus on Security Management. The Quality Control plan covers all key activities of the Contractor, the teaming partners, and the subcontractors. It clearly demonstrates how customer satisfaction will be achieved and maintained. The Quality Control Plan fully integrates with the Government-provided Service Level Agreements (SLAs) and the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP). The Quality Control Plan is comprehensive, recognizes likely trouble points, has strong management controls, and concentrates on areas such as ETRS Ticketing and Fulfillment and TMC Integration. The Offeror's performance measurement approach is sound.

Requirements associated with creating, routing, amending, and managing travel documents should result in a satisfactory system. Requirements call for an easy to use ETS2 that meets user efficiency, effectiveness, and satisfaction goals. Technology refresh plans and innovation plans assure that the ETS2 will remain highly functional, comparable with other commercially available capabilities, and policy compliant. There are written agreements with key partners, team members, and subcontractors, including TMCs.

In evaluating the Project Management Plan for transition and implementation services, the Government is evaluating the proposal to ensure that there is no break in service between ETS1 and ETS2. The Offeror should clearly delineate their transition and implementation plan under a single award scenario and a dual award scenario, specifically calling out differences between the two, if any. With an extended agency transition time, there must be a clear and focused strategy to help bring agencies on-board and to minimize costs for agencies and out-going contractors. The Government requires a clear, logical, and focused plan to ramp up, bring agencies on-board, have them trained, prepared and able to use ETS2. Agency communication must be clearly addressed, timeframes and capabilities documented, and agency responsibilities clearly defined. A successful plan identifies key areas of transition and implementation risk and addresses realistic and cost-effective ways to manage. Additionally, a successful transition plan also clearly understands that the ETS2 program itself will end and provides good assurance of cooperation and concrete actions the incumbent will take as articulated in a Transition-Out Plan to any future follow-on vehicle. The Transition Out-Plan adequately addresses processes, personnel, schedule, communications, and data. It also recognizes the potential for performance issues and failure, change of ownership and bankruptcies, and provides a risk mitigation plan that enables travel to continue with the least amount of disruption.

An outstanding Project Management Plan not only comprehensively addresses migration to ETS2 and how their ETS2 proposes to meet all mandatory requirements; it also completely addresses all objectives. It leaves the Government confident that not only will the Contractor perform successfully, but that it will deliver superior service from contract kickoff all the way through close-out. The Project Management Plan address how, through the entire contract, the Offeror will measure, taken into account, and make improvements to ETS2 to ensure a customer-centric solution.

An outstanding Project Management plan exceeds the ease of use and intuitiveness objectives of the RFP. All data and interoperability goals are met. The Offeror's organizational structure has well-defined roles and responsibilities, clear lines of reporting, appropriate authority levels to accomplish tasks and resolve issues quickly, and a robust communication plan that is proactive and keeps Users and GSA well informed. There is a clear well-articulated focus on Security Management. The Quality Control Plan covers all key activities of the contractor, the team members, and the subcontractors. It clearly demonstrates how superior customer satisfaction will be achieved and maintained. The Quality Control Plan fully integrates with the Government-provided SLAs and the QASP. The Offeror's performance measurement approach ensures continuous improvement of ETS2.

Plans associated with creating, routing, amending, and managing travel documents should result in a superior system. Plans call for an easy to use ETS2 with user efficiency, effectiveness, and satisfaction goals addressed. Technology refresh plans and innovation requirements assure that the system will always be state-of-the art. There are written agreements with key partners, team members, and subcontractors, including TMCs where roles and responsibilities are fully addressed and demonstrates a clear accountability trail. The Quality Control Plan is comprehensive, recognizes likely trouble points, and concentrates on areas such as ETRS Ticketing and Fulfillment, TMC Integration, and streamlined customer billing. It documents specific roles and responsibilities in SLAs and provides service safeguards.

In evaluating the Project Management Plan for transition and implementation services, the Government is evaluating the proposal to ensure that there is no break in service between ETS1 and ETS2 and there is a seamless transition whether a single or dual award is made. Offeror(s) should clearly delineate their transition and implementation plan under a single award scenario and a dual award scenario, specifically calling out differences between the two, if any. With an extended agency transition time, the strategy to help bring agencies on-board is clear, focused, and incentivizes the agencies to make the switch while minimizing costs for agencies and out-going contractors. This includes, but is not limited to, minimizing data-entry of employee and hierarchy/routing information, providing additional qualified resources to aid in transition, etc. The Government is also looking to see a clear, logical, and focused plan to quickly ramp up, bring agencies on-board, have them trained, prepared and able to use ETS2. Agency communication must be clearly addressed, timeframes and capabilities documented, and agency responsibilities clearly defined. An outstanding plan identifies key areas of transition and implementation risk, eliminates them, and minimizes agency costs to transition. Additionally, an outstanding transition plan also clearly understands that the ETS2 program itself will end and does more than provide good assurance of cooperation—it addresses processes, personnel, schedule, communications, and data. It also recognizes the potential for performance issues and failure, change of ownership and bankruptcies, and provides a detailed risk mitigation plan that enables travel to continue with the least amount of disruption. An outstanding plan provides detailed commitments of experienced, qualified resources, concrete actions the incumbent will take as articulated in a robust Transition-Out Plan to any future follow-on vehicle, reduces agencies' transition costs, and demonstrates a seamless and timely transition.

F.3.2.3 Technical Factor Three –Demonstration – Phase I:

To be acceptable, the Government will look for evidence confirming what was communicated in the written proposals is evident in the technology demonstrated. The Demonstration must showcase the Offeror's intended production capabilities. The solution must show that mandatory requirements and proposed objectives are met for the functionality included in the demonstration (as outlined in Section E.6.3 - Content); that there is functionality for the travel planning, travel authorization, travel advances, and travel vouchers for various types of travel and various user roles; that data is collected and

maintained IAW existing security standards and data exchanges and reports are accurate and easy to use.

An outstanding Demonstration must showcase production capabilities ready to be used with only minor modifications for ETS2 that exceeds the Government's requirements. The solution demonstrates that all mandatory requirements and objectives are met. Not only does the solution have all basic functionality required, but it is easy to use, intuitive, provides canned and ad-hoc reporting features, and exceeds required security standards.

F.3.2.4 Technical Factor Four – Key Personnel/Resumes – Phase I:

To be acceptable, the Key Personnel Plan must demonstrate the ability to recruit, retain and manage personnel. The Government requires assurance that the team proposed has the subject matter expertise, the experience, and the communication skills necessary to have a high likelihood of success under the contract. It is looking for evidence that the key personnel are well qualified, experienced, have the position within the company to “get things done” and that the overall key personnel team brings to bear relevant Government and industry experience in contracts of this size, scope, and complexity.

Outstanding Key Personnel/Resumes demonstrate effective resources that can plan, control, direct and accomplish the services under this contract. The Key Personnel Plan covers all this and areas such as position management, staffing practices, performance management, discipline, awards, delegations of authority, and employee development. Not only are key personnel well qualified, experienced, have the position within the company to “get things done,” each key personnel member brings subject matter expertise and industry/government expertise in similarly situated travel management service contracts.

F.3.2.5 Non-Technical Factor One – Socio-Economic – Phase I:

Ensuring continual small business opportunity is a central goal for this acquisition. The acceptable proposal meets GSA's subcontracting goals and creates a clear and consistent opportunity for small business to play a role as team members and subcontractors throughout the life of the contract.

An outstanding proposal does more than create opportunity—it exceeds GSA's subcontracting goals and it provides greater roles for small business that are advantageous to the Government. The Offeror invests in small businesses by giving them the gift of time and the benefit of its experience, through mentoring or other coaching experiences.

F.3.2.6 Non-Technical Factor Two – Past Performance – Phase I:

Past performance will be evaluated as part of the risk management strategy under this contract. All past performance must be for projects which are on-going or completed within the last three years, and all for projects of a similar size, scope, or complexity as the requirements under this contract.

The rating for this factor will result from the comments received from the references, and any other information available to the Government. The Contracting Officer may identify and analyze the past performance of the Offeror on any other contract or project that they currently have or had of which the Contracting Officer has knowledge or obtains knowledge. Because of the wide variety of past performance history of individual Offerors, the Government is not required to ensure that an equal number of references be obtained for each Offeror.

An acceptable proposal has at least acceptable past performance ratings in all rated areas. An outstanding proposal consistently demonstrates high performance ratings in all rated areas and has performed projects most similar to these efforts, such as an electronic travel contract for a Fortune 100

company or a major Government Department. Offeror(s) without a record of past performance will receive a neutral rating under this factor.

F.3.2.7 Price Factor – Phase I:

The Government is considering making either a single award or two awards under this RFP.

The Offeror's Price proposal will be evaluated, using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR, in order to determine if it is reasonable and realistic.

Price analysis will be conducted on the following potential award scenarios:

- Single award
- Dual awards
- Single award vs. dual award variance

For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Pricing among CLINs proposed must be balanced. The Offeror's Price proposal will be evaluated based upon the total price proposed for the noted CLINs in the Table F-1 below for the base and each option period. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.

For purposes of price evaluation, the Government will evaluate the sum of the base period pricing for the CLINs noted in the Table F-1 below and their corresponding option period pricing based on the Government's estimated quantities to determine the overall contract price. Quantities are used for evaluation purposes only and are no guarantee of volumes under any resultant contract(s). Estimated quantities are included in Section B.

The remaining CLINs not otherwise noted in Table F-1 will be evaluated for price reasonableness as outlined in Section F.6.2.5.1.

Table F-1 – Price Evaluation – Phase I

Base	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
0001AA, 0001AB, 0001AC, 0001AD, 0001AE, 0001AF, and 0001AG, 0001AH	0021AA, 0021AB, 0021AC, 0021AD, 0021AE, 0021AF, 0021AG, and 0021AH	0041AA, 0041AB, 0041AC, 0041AD, 0041AE, 0041AF, 0041AG, and 0041AH	0061AA, 0061AB, 0061AC, 0061AD, 0061AE, 0061AF, 0061AG and 0061AH
0001SBAA, 0001SBAB, 0001SBAC, 0001SBAD, 0001SBAE, 0001SBAF, 0001SBAG, and 0001SBAH	0021SBAA, 0021SBAB, 0021SBAC, 0021SBAD, 0021SBAE, 0021SBAF, 0021SBAG, and 0021SBAH	0041SBAA, 0041SBAB, 0041SBAC, 0041SBAD, 0041SBAE, 0041SBAF, 0041SBAG, and 0041SBAH	0061SBAA, 0061SBAB, 0061SBAC, 0061SBAD, 0061SBAE, 0061SBAF, 0061SBAG, and 0061SBAH
0002AA, 0002AB	0022AA, 0022AB	0042AA, 0042AB	0062AA, 0062AB
0002JAA	0022JAA	0042JAA	0062JAA
0003AA, 0003AB, and 0003AC	0023AA, 0023AB, and 0023AC	0043AA, 0043AB, and 0043AC	0063AA, 0063AB, and 0063AC
0004	0024	0044	0064
0005AA, 0005AB, 0005AC, and 0005AD	0025AA, 0025AB, 0025AC, and 0025AD	0045AA, 0045AB, 0045AC, and 0045AD	0065AA, 0065AB, 0065AC, and 0065AD
Sum of CLINs above x sum of estimated quantities, plus →	Sum of CLINs above x sum of estimated quantities, plus →	Sum of CLINs above x sum of estimated quantities, plus →	Sum of CLINs above x sum of estimated quantities
TOTAL EVALUATED CONTRACT PRICE will be based on the CLINs noted above as follows—Base + Option 1 + Option 2 + Option 3			

The rest of this page is intentionally blank.

The following is provided as an example of how the Government may evaluate price.

Table F-2 – Sample Price Evaluation

Sample Price Evaluation - Base Period (3 Years):

CLIN	Description	Sample Estimated Quantity	Sample Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Sample Total
0001	ETS2 Reservation and Fulfillment Services (Large Business (LB) TMC)					
0001AA	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/Air/Rail	599,854	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$599,854.00
0001AB	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	31,572	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$31,572.00
0001AC	LB ATRS Domestic w/Air/Rail	289,216	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$289,216.00
0001AD	LB ATRS Intl w/Air/Rail	32,135	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$32,135.00
0001AE	LB ATRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	16,913	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$16,913.00
0001AF	OTRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/Air/Rail	149,964	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$149,964.00

Table F-2 – Sample Price Evaluation - Continued

CLIN	Description	Sample Estimated Quantity	Sample Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Sample Total
0001AG	LB ATRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	7,893	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$7,893.00
0001AH	LB ATMC QCP	515,142	\$1.00	Each Transaction	FFP	\$515,142.00
0001SB	ETS2 Reservation and Fulfillment Services (Small Business (SB) TMC)					
0001SBAA	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/Air/Rail	599,854	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$599,854.00
0001SBAB	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	31,572	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$31,572.00
0001SBAC	SB ATRS Domestic w/Air/Rail	289,216	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$289,216.00
0001SBAD	SB ATRS Intl w/Air/Rail	32,135	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$32,135.00
0001SBAE	SB ATRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	16,913	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$16,913.00
0001SBAF	OTRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/Air/Rail	149,964	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$149,964.00
0001SBAG	SB ATRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	7,893	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$7,893.00

Table F-2 – Sample Price Evaluation - Continued

CLIN	Description	Sample Estimated Quantity	Sample Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Sample Total
0001SBAH	SBATMC QCP	515,142	\$1.00	Each Transaction	FFP	\$515,142.00
0002	ETS2 Authorization and Voucher Services					
0002AA	Local Voucher	468,325	\$1.00	Each Local Voucher	FFP	\$468,325.00
0002AB	TDY Voucher	1,761,792	\$1.00	Each TDY Voucher	FFP	\$1,761,792.00
0002J	ETS2 JFTR Authorization and Voucher Services					
0002JAA	TDY Voucher	154,660	\$1.00	Each TDY Voucher	FFP	\$154,660.00
0003	Paper Ticket Issuance and Delivery					
0003AA	Paper Ticket w/U.S. Mail Delivery	1,748	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$1,748.00
0003AB	Paper Ticket w/Express Delivery	8,739	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$8,739.00
0003AC	Paper Ticket w/Courier Delivery	1,748	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$1,748.00
0004	International Rate Desk	84	\$1.00	Each Ticket	FFP	\$84.00
0005	Standard Implementation Services					
0005AA	Service Level A	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$1.00
0005AB	Service Level B	3	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$3.00
0005AC	Service Level C	4	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$4.00
0005AD	Service Level D	16	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$16.00

SUBTOTAL BASE PERIOD (CLINs 0001 - 0005)

\$5,682,522.00

Table F-2 – Sample Price Evaluation - Continued

Option 1 (4 Years):

CLIN	Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Total
0021	ETS2 Reservation and Fulfillment Services (Large Business (LB) TMC)					
0021AA	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/Air/Rail	3,140,590	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$3,140,590.00
0021AB	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	165,295	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$165,295.00
0021AC	LB ATRS Domestic w/Air/Rail	1,514,214	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$1,514,214.00
0021AD	LB ATRS Intl w/Air/Rail	168,245	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$168,245.00
0021AE	LB ATRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	88,551	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$88,551.00
0021AF	OTRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/Air/Rail	785,149	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$785,149.00
0021AG	LB ATRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	41,323	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$41,323.00
0021AH	LB ATMC QCP	2,697,069	\$1.00	Each Transaction	FFP	\$2,697,069.00
0021SB						
0021SBAA	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/Air/Rail	3,140,590	\$ 1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$3,140,590.00

Table F-2 – Sample Price Evaluation - Continued

CLIN	Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Total
0021SBAB	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	165,295	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$165,295.00
0021SBAC	SB ATRS Domestic w/Air/Rail	1,514,214	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$1,514,214.00
0021SBAD	SB ATRS Intl w/Air/Rail	168,245	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$168,245.00
0021SBAE	SB ATRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	88,551	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$88,551.00
0021SBAF	OTRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/Air/Rail	785,149	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$785,149.00
0021SBAG	SB ATRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	41,323	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$41,323.00
0021SBAH	SB ATMC QCP	2,697,069	\$1.00	Each Transaction	FFP	\$2,697,069.00
0022	ETS2 Authorization and Voucher Services					
0022AA	Local Voucher	2,451,952	\$1.00	Each Local Voucher	FFP	\$ 2,451,952.00
0022AB	TDY Voucher	9,224,012	\$1.00	Each TDY Voucher	FFP	\$9,224,012.00
0022J	ETS2 JFTR Authorization and Voucher Services					
0022JAA	TDY Voucher	809,733	\$1.00	Each Voucher	FFP	\$809,733.00

Table F-2 – Sample Price Evaluation - Continued

CLIN	Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Total
0023	Paper Ticket Issuance and Delivery					
0023AA	Paper Ticket w/U.S. Mail Delivery	9,152	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$9,152.00
0023AB	Paper Ticket w/Express Delivery	45,755	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$45,755.00
0023AC	Paper Ticket w/Courier Delivery	9,152	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$9,152.00
0024	International Rate Desk	443	\$1.00	Each Ticket	FFP	\$443.00
0025	Standard Implementation Services					
0025AA	Service Level A	1	\$ 1.00	Lot	NTE	\$1.00
0025AB	Service Level B	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$1.00
0025AC	Service Level C	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$1.00
0025AD	Service Level D	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$1.00

SUBTOTAL OPTION 1 (CLINs 0021 - 0025)

\$29,751,075.00

Option 2 (4 Years):

CLIN	Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Total
0041	ETS2 Reservation and Fulfillment Services (Large Business (LB) TMC)					
0041AA	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/Air/Rail	3,177,464	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$3,177,464.00
0041AB	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	167,236	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$167,236.00
0041AC	LB ATRS Domestic w/Air/Rail	1,531,992	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$1,531,992.00

Table F-2 – Sample Price Evaluation - Continued

CLIN	Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Total
0041AD	LB ATRS Intl w/Air/Rail	170,220	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$170,220.00
0041AE	LB ATRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	89,590	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$89,590.00
0041AF	OTRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/Air/Rail	794,368	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$794,368.00
0041AG	LB ATRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	41,808	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$41,808.00
0041AH	LB ATMC QCP	2,728,736	\$1.00	Each Transaction	FFP	\$2,728,736.00
0041SB	ETS2 Reservation and Fulfillment Services (Small Business (SB) TMC)					
0041SBAA	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/Air/Rail	3,177,464	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$3,177,464.00
0041SBAB	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	167,236	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$167,236.00
0041SBAC	SB ATRS Domestic w/Air/Rail	1,531,992	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$1,531,992.00
0041SBAD	SB ATRS Intl w/Air/Rail	170,220	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$170,220.00
0041SBAE	SB ATRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	89,590	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$89,590.00

Table F-2 – Sample Price Evaluation - Continued

CLIN	Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Total
0041SBAF	OTRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/Air/Rail	794,368	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$794,368.00
0041SBAG	SB ATRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	41,808	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$41,808.00
0041SBAH	SB ATMC QCP	2,728,736	\$1.00	Each Transaction	FFP	\$2,728,736.00
0042	ETS2 Authorization and Voucher Services					
0042AA	Local Voucher	2,480,740	\$1.00	Each Local Voucher	FFP	\$2,480,740.00
0042AB	TDY Voucher	9,332,312	\$1.00	Each TDY Voucher	FFP	\$9,332,312.00
0042J	ETS2 JFTR Authorization and Voucher Services					
0042JAA	TDY Voucher	819,240	\$1.00	Each TDY Voucher	FFP	\$819,240.00
0043	Paper Ticket Issuance and Delivery					
0043AA	Paper Ticket w/U.S. Mail Delivery	9,260	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$9,260.00
0043AB	Paper Ticket w/Express Delivery	46,292	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$46,292.00
0043AC	Paper Ticket w/Courier Delivery	9,260	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$9,260.00
0044	International Rate Desk	448	\$1.00	Each Ticket	FFP	\$448.00
0045	Standard Implementation Services					
0045AA	Service Level A	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$136,087.00
0045AB	Service Level B	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$247,768.00
0045AC	Service Level C	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$507,436.00
0045AD	Service Level D	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$1,032,919.00

Table F-2 – Sample Price Evaluation - Continued

CLIN	Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Total
------	-------------	--------------------	------------	---------------	-------------	-------

SUBTOTAL OPTION 2 (CLINs 0041 - 0045)

\$33,948,800.00

Option 3 (4 Years):

CLIN	Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Total
0061	ETS2 Reservation and Fulfillment Services (Large Business (LB) TMC)					
0061AA	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/Air/Rail	3,177,464	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$3,177,464.00
0061AB	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	167,236	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$167,236.00
0061AC	LB ATRS Domestic w/Air/Rail	1,531,992	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$1,531,992.00
0061AD	LB ATRS Intl w/Air/Rail	170,220	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$170,220.00
0061AE	LB ATRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	89,590	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$89,590.00
0061AF	OTRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/Air/Rail	794,368	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$794,368.00
0061AG	LB ATRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	41,808	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$41,808.00
0061AH	LB ATMC QCP	2,728,736	\$1.00	Each Transaction	FFP	\$2,728,736.00

Table F-2 – Sample Price Evaluation - Continued

CLIN	Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Total
0061SB	ETS2 Reservation and Fulfillment Services (Small Business (SB) TMC)					
0061SBAA	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/Air/Rail	3,177,464	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$3,177,464.00
0061SBAB	OTRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	167,236	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$167,236.00
0061SBAC	SB ATRS Domestic w/Air/Rail	1,531,992	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$1,531,992.00
0061SBAD	SB ATRS Intl w/Air/Rail	170,220	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$170,220.00
0061SBAE	SB ATRS Domestic/Intl w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	89,590	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$89,590.00
0061SBAF	OTRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/Air/Rail	794,368	\$1.00	Each Transaction A	FFP	\$794,368.00
0061SBAG	SB ATRS Domestic/Intl RESERVATION ONLY w/o Air/Rail (Lodging and/or Car Only)	41,808	\$1.00	Each Transaction B	FFP	\$41,808.00
0061SBAH	SB ATMC QCP	2,728,736	\$1.00	Each Transaction	FFP	\$2,728,736.00
0062	ETS2 Authorization and Voucher Services					
0062AA	Local Voucher	2,480,740	\$ 1.00	Each Local Voucher	FFP	\$2,480,740.00
0062AB	TDY Voucher	9,332,312	\$1.00	Each TDY Voucher	FFP	\$9,332,312.00

Table F-2 – Sample Price Evaluation - Continued

CLIN	Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit Price	Unit of Issue	Type of Fee	Total
0062J	ETS2 JFTR Authorization and Voucher Services					
0062JAA	TDY Voucher	819,240	\$1.00	Each TDY Voucher	FFP	\$819,240.00
0063	Paper Ticket Issuance and Delivery					
0063AA	Paper Ticket w/U.S. Mail Delivery	9,260	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$9,260.00
0063AB	Paper Ticket w/Express Delivery	46,292	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$46,292.00
0063AC	Paper Ticket w/Courier Delivery	9,260	\$1.00	Each Ticket	NTE	\$9,260.00
0064	International Rate Desk	448	\$1.00	Each Ticket	FFP	\$448.00
0065	Standard Implementation Services					
0065AA	Service Level A	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$136,087.00
0065AB	Service Level B	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$247,768.00
0065AC	Service Level C	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$507,436.00
0065AD	Service Level D	1	\$1.00	Lot	NTE	\$1,032,919.00

SUBTOTAL OPTION 3 (CLINs 0061 - 0065)

\$33,948,800.00

TOTAL EVALUATED CONTRACT PRICE (BASE PLUS OPTIONS 1, 2, and 3)

\$103,331,1929.00

At the end of Phase I evaluations, the Government may establish the competitive range. The Contracting Officer may determine that the number of most highly rated proposals that might otherwise be included in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted. Accordingly, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition during Phase II among the most highly rated proposals.

F.3.2.7.1 Refinement of Price Evaluation:

The Government reserves the right to further refine its evaluation of the Offeror's pricing approach in a manner that will best serve the Government's interest.

F.4 ADJECTIVE RATINGS FOR PHASE I

Evaluators will follow the specific evaluation standards noted for each evaluation factor (see Section F.3.2.1 for Technical Factor One; F.3.2.2 for Technical Factor Two; F.3.2.3 for Technical Factor Three; F.3.2.4 for Technical Factor Four; F.3.2.5 Non-Technical Factor One; and F.3.2.6 Non-Technical Factor Two) and summarize their Phase I evaluations using the following adjectival rating table. Evaluators will select one of the adjectival ratings that most clearly reflect the assessment of the overall proposal(s) based on the established evaluation criteria. Price proposals will not receive an adjectival rating.

The standards that will be used in evaluating proposals are as follows:

TABLE F-3: Technical and Non-Technical Factor Adjectival Ratings	
RATING	Description
Outstanding	An outstanding proposal contains significant strengths and no weaknesses. The technical proposal exceeds the performance and technical capability requirements defined in the Statement of Work (SOW). The proposal offers value-added methodologies for improving service that benefits the Government. The evaluator has no doubt that the Offeror can successfully achieve the requirements in the SOW if the technical approach proposed is followed. The Offeror acknowledges risks and develops an approach that proactively identifies and mitigates risks, and looks to reduce or eliminate future risks.
Very Good	A very good proposal contains significant strengths, and only a few minor weaknesses. The proposal meets the performance and technical capability requirements as defined in the SOW. The evaluator has a high degree of confidence that the Offeror can successfully achieve the requirements in the SOW if the technical approach proposed is followed. The Offeror acknowledges technical or schedule risk and develops an approach capable of mitigating all apparent risks effectively.
Acceptable	An acceptable proposal contains strengths that outweigh any existing weaknesses. The Offeror's proposal meets the performance and technical capability requirements defined in the SOW. The evaluator is confident that the Offeror can successfully achieve the requirements in the SOW if the technical approach proposed is followed.
Marginal	A marginal proposal does not meet Government requirements necessary for acceptable contract performance, but issues are correctable. The Offeror's proposal contains one or more significant weaknesses.
Unacceptable	An unacceptable proposal fails to meet the preponderance of specified minimum performance and technical capability requirements defined in the SOW. The Offeror's proposal contains numerous weaknesses and/or deficiencies, or contains weaknesses and/or deficiencies that are not correctable. The evaluator is confident that the Offeror will be unable to successfully complete the required tasking. The proposal does not adequately acknowledge or address risk, mitigate risk, or may actually introduce risk.

F.5 PHASE II EVALUATION - INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION (IV&V)

F.5.1 Evaluation Methodology – Phase II:

The determination of which Offeror(s) moves forward to IV&V will depend on the outcome of Phase I evaluations and will be based on the evaluation team’s consensus ratings.

The Offeror(s) will be subject to IV&V of its/their ETS2 based on the Government-developed test scenarios designed to validate the ETS2 solution offered and reach the final award decision(s). The purpose of IV&V is to provide an unbiased review of the prospective ETS2 service against the stated requirements and objectives in the solicitation.

IV&V will be used as an additional factor in reaching a best value award decision(s) as set forth in herein. This additional factor will serve to separate and distinguish the most highly rated proposal(s). The validation will confirm the Offeror’s service requirements and objectives as put forth in their proposals and document the test results, and will contain computational, usability, data exchange, security and 508 accessibility evaluations.

F.5.2 Test Framework:

Each Offeror’s service will be tested. At the conclusion of each test assessment, a report will be generated with the test results and provided to the evaluation team for evaluation. The Offeror’s representative will document the version of the service at the beginning of the overall test period and once established, no changes to the ETS2 service will be allowed except for documented changes needed for configurable service settings. All Offeror’s ETS2 versions for IV&V testing will be confirmed on the same day. Once the version has been established, no changes will be permitted.

F.5.3 Test Assessment and Schedule:

The time for testing is expected to be between 6 to 9 weeks, and may be adjusted at the Government’s direction. A notional schedule is provided below along with the categories of tests that could be applicable.

Computational – 1 to 3 weeks

The computational phase may test the computational accuracy of the Offeror’s ETS2 service. Test scenarios based on official travel types as described in the ETS2 SOW may be used by test advisors to create documents within the ETS2 service and results printed or recorded electronically for review by a test auditor. The test auditor may then review the printed outputs of these scenarios for computational accuracy and certify the proper application of the FTR relative to M&IE, Lodging, International Date Line (IDL), etc. The results and the associated remediation plan will be collectively used to assess security performance prior to award.

Functional/Usability Testing – 3 to 6 weeks

The Functional/Usability phase of IV&V may be used to test the travel functionality and usability of an Offeror’s ETS2 service as outlined in the SOW and the Offeror’s proposal. These tests would include tests not covered under the computational testing to include routing, workflow and notifications, policy enforcement, types of travel, on-line booking, etc. The results and the associated remediation plan will be collectively used to assess security performance prior to award.

Security – Concurrent with Computational and Functional/Usability Testing

The security phase may test the Security of the Offeror's ETS2 service through conducting a modified Certification and Accreditation. This testing is anticipated to include the following reviews, some of which may occur as part of the Computational, and Functional/Usability testing. Security testing is not anticipated to confirm mandatory requirements related to the ETS2 service inside the production data center and co-mingling/ physical separation requirements. These requirements will be validated as part of the post-award Certification and Accreditation processes.

- 1) Authenticated operating system, database, and application vulnerability scans performed by FAS
- 2) Access privileges based on user roles and use cases
- 3) Password strength and reset processes
- 4) Two factor authentication
- 5) Email messaging confirmation
- 6) Rules of behavior
- 7) Audit trails
 - a) Event Monitoring
 - b) Application – modifications to ETS (Profile changes, Administrative configuration changes, etc.)
- 8) Browser security
- 9) Mobile Device testing (to the extent it is offered and applicable to a modified C&A)

The results and the associated remediation plan will be collectively used to assess security performance prior to award.

Section 508/Accessibility testing – 1 to 6 weeks, Concurrent with Computational and Functional/Usability Testing

Section 508 may be tested at an agency established accessibility facility using a cross section of agency participants from their respective accessibility offices. Section 508 testing is anticipated to use the following testing applications:

- a) JAWS version 11,
- b) Window Eyes,
- c) Dragon Naturally Speaking,
- d) Common Look, and
- e) PAW

The 508 testing shall confirm the extent to which the ETS2 proposed meets applicable accessibility standards of 36 CFR 1194, “Electronic and Information Technology Accessibility Standards,” that can be met with supplies, services, or assistive technologies that are available in the commercial marketplace.

The Section 508 results will be provided to the Offeror in the form of VPAT report and similar reports, and the Offeror will be required to submit a remediation plan and firm dates for correcting any deficiencies as applicable. The results and the associated remediation plan will be collectively used to assess 508 performance prior to award.

F.6 PHASE II – EVALUATION CRITERIA:

The Government will use the evaluation factors as described below:

IV& V Technical Factors

- Computational Ratings
- Functional/Usability
- Security
- Section 508/Accessibility

IV&V Non-Technical Factors

- Price

F.6.1 Relative Importance of Evaluation Factors for Phase II:

Technical Factors: Computational Ratings, Functional/Usability, Security, and Section 508/Accessibility, are equally important.

Price Factors: Price.

- When combined, technical factors are more important than price.
- As technical merit becomes more equal, price becomes more important.

F.6.2 Basis of Award for Phase II:

The most highly rated proposal(s) will move forward to Phase II as outlined earlier.

F.6.2.1 Technical Factor One - Computational Ratings – Phase II:

In evaluating Computational Ratings, the Government will determine ETS2’s computational accuracy for various types of travel. An acceptable proposal demonstrates at least at 98% accuracy rate and can properly apply the FTR relative to M&IE, lodging, etc. An acceptable proposal also provides a remediation plan with firm dates for correcting inaccuracies as applicable.

An outstanding proposal delivers 100% accuracy and in the ETS2’s ability to properly apply the FTR relative to M&IE, lodging, etc.

F.6.2.2 Technical Factor Two – Functional/Usability Ratings – Phase II:

In evaluating the Functional/Usability Ratings, the Government requires ETS2 to be efficient, easy to use, and will result in high User-satisfaction. An acceptable ETS2 meets specified minimum performance, capability requirements, or objectives necessary for acceptable contact performance in a way beneficial to the Government. Test scenarios are completed in a somewhat fast and efficient manner. Almost all the test scenarios were acceptable ease of use and intuitive navigation.

An outstanding ETS2 greatly exceeds specified minimum performance, capability requirements, and objectives in a way greatly beneficial to the Government. Test scenarios were completed in a very fast and efficient manner. All items in the test scenarios are demonstrated intuitively with a high level of ease of use and simple, intuitive navigation.

F.6.2.3 Technical Factor Three – Security – Phase II:

In evaluating the Security, the Government requires ETS2 to secure access and result in customer confidence of all security aspects of ETS2. An acceptable ETS2 meets specified minimum performance requirements, capability requirements or objectives in a way beneficial to the Government. Access to and within ETS2 is secure; ETS2 protects the integrity of the travel process; and ETS2 protects all data as CUI.

An outstanding ETS2 greatly exceeds specified minimum performance, capability requirements, and objectives in a way greatly beneficial to the Government. The Offeror meets and exceeds the standard for acceptable by including ISSO contact information and providing security objectives as identified in the SOW.

F.6.2.4 Technical Factor Four – Section 508/Accessibility Testing – Phase II:

In evaluating Section 508/Accessibility, the Government requires ETS2 to enhance an individual's ability to obtain and use information quickly and easily. An acceptable ETS2 meets Government requirements in a way beneficial to the Government and meets accessibility standards.

An outstanding ETS2 greatly exceeds specified minimum performance, capability requirements, and objectives in a way greatly beneficial to the Government. The Offeror's ETS2 solution provides improved functionality or exceeds accessibility requirements.

F.6.2.5 Price Factor – Phase II:

The Government is considering making either a single award or two awards under this RFP.

The Offeror's Price proposal will be evaluated, using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR, in order to determine if it is reasonable and realistic.

Price analysis will be conducted on the following potential award scenarios:

- Single award
- Dual awards
- Single award vs. dual award variance

For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Pricing among CLINs proposed must be balanced. The Offeror's Price proposal will be evaluated based upon the total price proposed for the noted CLINs in the

Table F-4 below for the base period and each option period. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.

For purposes of price evaluation, the Government will evaluate the sum of the base period pricing for the CLINs noted in the Table F-4 below and their corresponding option period pricing based on the Government's estimated quantities to determine the overall contract price. Quantities are used for evaluation purposes only and are no guarantee of volumes under any resultant contract(s). Estimated quantities are included in Section B.

The remaining CLINs not otherwise noted in Table F-4 will be evaluated for price reasonableness as outlined in Section F.6.2.5.1.

Table F-4 – Price Evaluation – Phase II

Base	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
0001AA, 0001AB, 0001AC, 0001AD, 0001AE, 0001AF, 0001AG, and 0001AH	0021AA, 0021AB, 0021AC, 0021AD, 0021AE, 0021AF, 0021AG, and 0021AH	00401AA, 0041AB, 0041AC, 0041AD, 0041AE, 0041AF, 0041AG, and 0041AH	0061AA, 0061AB, 0061AC, 0061AD, 0061AE, 0061AF, 0061AG, and 0061AH
0001SBAA, 0001SBAB, 0001SBAC, 0001SBAD, 0001SBAE, 0001SBAF, 0001SBAG, 0001SBAH	0021SBAA, 0021SBAB, 0021SBAC, 0021SBAD, 0021SBAE, 0021SBAF, 0021SBAG, and 0021SBAH	0041SBAA, 0041SBAB, 0041SBAC, 0041SBAD, 0041SBAE, 0041SBAF, 0041SBAG, and 0041SBAH	0061SBAA, 0061SBAB, 0061SBAC, 0061SBAD, 0061SBAE, 0061SBAF, 0061SBAG, and 0061SBAH
0002AA, 0002AB	0022AA, 0022AB	0042AA, 0042AB	0062AA, 0062AB
0002JAA	0022JAA	0042JAA	0062JAA
0003AA, 0003AB, and 0003AC	0023AA, 0023AB, and 0023AC	0043AA, 0043AB, and 0043AC	0063AA, 0063AB, and 0063AC
0004	0024	0044	0064
0005AA, 0005AB, 0005AC, and 0005AD	0025AA, 0025AB, 0025AC, and 0025AD	0045AA, 0045AB, 0045AC, and 0045AD	0065AA, 0065AB, 0065AC, and 0065AD
Sum of CLINs above x sum of estimated quantities, plus →	Sum of CLINs above x sum of estimated quantities, plus →	Sum of CLINs above x sum of estimated quantities, plus →	Sum of CLINs above x sum of estimated quantities
TOTAL EVALUATED CONTRACT PRICE will be based on the CLINs noted above as follows—Base + Option 1 + Option 2 + Option 3			

Phase II will follow the same price evaluation example as provided in Phase I.

The Government reserves the right to further refine the pricing approach that will best serve the needs of the Government.

F.6.2.5.1: REMAINING CLINs

The remaining base period CLINs and their corresponding option period pricing not included in the Tables F-1 and F-4 will only be evaluated to ascertain that the price offered is fair and reasonable. For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Pricing among CLINs proposed must be balanced.

The following CLINs will be evaluated for fair and reasonable pricing:

Table F-5: CLINs Evaluated for Fair and Reasonable Pricing

Base	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
0006AA, 0006AB, 0006AC, and 0006AD	0026AA, 0026AB, 0026AC, and 0026AD	0046AA, 0046AB, 0046AC, and 0046AD	0066AA, 0066AB, 0066AC, and 0066AD
0007AA and 0007AB	0027AA and 0027AB	0047AA and 0047AB	0067AA and 0067AB
0008AA and 0008AB	0028AA and 0028AB	0048AA and 0048AB	0068AA and 0068AB
0009	0029	0049	0069
0010	0030	0050	0070
0011	0031	0051	0071
0012AA, 0012AB, and 0012AC	0032AA, 0032AB, and 0032AC	0052AA, 0052AB, and 0052AC	0072AA, 0072AB, and 0072AC
0013	0033	0053	0073
0014	0034	0054	0074
0016	0036	0056	0076
0017	0037	0057	0077
0018	0038	0058	0078
0019	0039	0059	0079

F.6.2.5.2: Refinement of Price Evaluation:

The Government reserves the right to further refine its evaluation of the Offeror's pricing approach in a manner that will best serve the Government's interest.

F.7 ADJECTIVE RATINGS FOR PHASE II

Evaluators will follow the specific evaluation standards noted for each evaluation factor (see Section F.6.2.1 for Technical Factor One; F.6.2.2 for Technical Factor Two; F.6.2.3 for Technical Factor Three; and F.6.2.4 for Technical Factor Four) and summarize their Phase II evaluations using the following adjectival rating tables. Evaluators will select one of the adjectival ratings that most clearly reflect the assessment of the proposals based on the established evaluation criteria. Price proposals will not receive an adjectival rating.

The standards that will be used in evaluating proposals are as follows:

TABLE F-6 – Technical and Non-Technical Factor Adjectival Ratings

RATING	Description
Outstanding	An outstanding proposal contains significant strengths and no weaknesses. The technical proposal exceeds the performance and technical capability requirements defined in the Statement of Work (SOW). The proposal offers value-added methodologies for improving service that benefits the Government. The evaluator has no doubt that the Offeror can successfully achieve the requirements in the SOW if the technical approach proposed is followed. The Offeror acknowledges risks and develops an approach that proactively identifies and mitigates risks, and looks to reduce or eliminate future risks.
Very Good	A very good proposal contains significant strengths, and only a few minor weaknesses. The proposal meets the performance and technical capability requirements as defined in the SOW. The evaluator has a high degree of confidence that the Offeror can successfully achieve the requirements in the SOW if the technical approach proposed is followed. The Offeror acknowledges technical or schedule risk and develops an approach capable of mitigating all apparent risks effectively.
Acceptable	An acceptable proposal contains strengths that outweigh any existing weaknesses. The Offeror's proposal meets the performance and technical capability requirements defined in the SOW. The evaluator is confident that the Offeror can successfully achieve the requirements in the SOW if the technical approach proposed is followed.
Marginal	A marginal proposal does not meet Government requirements necessary for acceptable contract performance, but issues are correctable. The Offeror's proposal contains one or more significant weaknesses.
Unacceptable	An unacceptable proposal fails to meet the preponderance of specified minimum performance and technical capability requirements defined in the SOW. The Offeror's proposal contains numerous weaknesses and/or deficiencies, or contains weaknesses and/or deficiencies that are not correctable. The evaluator is confident that the Offeror will be unable to successfully complete the required tasking. The proposal does not adequately acknowledge or address risk, mitigate risk, or may actually introduce risk.

F.8 REJECTION OF UNREALISTIC OFFERS

The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program commitments, including contract terms and conditions, or unrealistically high or low in price when compared to Government estimates, or unbalanced pricing among CLINs, base and option periods such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.